

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 29, 2005. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully requested.

Claims 9-11, 13-15, 34-42 and 52-57 are pending. Claims 9-11, 13-15, 34-36, 39-41 and 52 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments can be found in the original disclosure and, therefore, no new matter has been added. Claims 9, 13, 34 and 39 are in independent form.

Claims 9-11, 13-15, 34-42 and 52-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,034,970 (*Levac et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,925,595 (*Whitledge et al.*). With regard to the claims as currently amended, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 9 and 13 as currently amended are directed to a server arrangement in which text inserted in a web page is detected. One or more character strings registered from the detected text is deleted. The one or more character strings are the same as one or more character strings registered in a predetermined file. A character string that represents the text from which the one or more character strings have been deleted is converted into a phonetic character string and the converted phonetic character string is transmitted to a client.

Independent Claims 34 and 39 as currently amended are directed to an information processing arrangement in which a reception unit receives a phonetic character string that represents text inserted in a web page from a server. A conversion unit converts the phonetic character string that represents the text into synthetic speech and a speech output unit outputs the speech. The server has a detection unit that detects the text from the web page. A deleting unit in the server deletes one or more character strings from the detected text. The one or more character strings are the same as one or more character strings registered in a predetermined file. A phonetic conversion unit in the server converts the character string that represents the text from which the one or more character strings have been deleted into a phonetic character string and a transmission unit in the server transmits the converted phonetic character string to the information processing apparatus.

In Applicants' view, Levac et al. discloses an intelligent messaging system that automatically conveys messages generated by a variety of message sources to one or more designated message recipients who receive communications via different types of communication devices. The system has a large character display. A message server automatically dispatches messages and updates to messages to a communication device interface which converts the message and message updates to a protocol compatible with the types of communication devices used by the designated message recipients. The converted message is further routed to local or remote communication destinations at which the message recipients' communication devices are located. Automatic, real-time updates of messages can thus be achieved.

In Applicants' opinion, Whitledge et al. discloses an arrangement for content conversion of electronic data using data mining. A user is able select one or more hypertext elements from one or more hypertext electronic document for conversion based on user conversion preferences. Selected hypertext elements are extracted from one or more hypertext electronic documents and converted into a format suitable for display on a user device based on user conversion preferences. Selected hypertext elements are extracted and converted using data mining conversion operations. The data mining conversion operations allow a user to extract only desired display information displayed from a hypertext element and convert the display information into a format different than that defined for the original electronic document. The converted display information is appropriate for a user device such as hand-held, wireless phone, personal digital assistant, or other device.

According to the invention of Claims 9, 13, 34 and 39, one or more character strings are deleted from a detected text where the one or more character strings are the same as one or more character strings registered in a predetermined file before converting the character string of the text into a phonetic character string. Advantageously, a user may listen only to the phonetic character string in the text in which character strings such as those that are not significant have been deleted and the user can change the character strings in the predetermined file to delete character strings of the text the user considers insignificant.

Levac et al. may disclose the use of server commands of “delete message” and “delete all messages”. As recognized by the Examiner, Levac et al. fails to disclose deleting character strings from a file that are the same as character strings registered in a predetermined file as in Claims 9, 13, 34 and 39. Further, Levac et al. is devoid of any disclosure relating to character strings and does not teach or suggest in any manner converting a character string that represents text from which the one or more character strings have been deleted into a phonetic character string.

Whitledge et al. may disclose that elements, sub-elements, text, etc. in an HTML or other hypertext electronic documents can be accessed, changed, deleted, or added using a Document Object Model. There is, however, no suggestion in Whitledge et al. of phonetic character strings or of deleting one or more character strings that are the same as one or more character strings stored in a predetermined file from a text before converting the character string of the text into a phonetic character string. Accordingly, it is not seen that Whitledge et al.’s creating or building documents, navigating their structure, and adding, modifying or deleting elements and content or otherwise editing documents in any manner suggests the feature of deleting one or more character strings based on their being the same as stored character strings as in Claims 9, 13, 34 and 39.

With regard to the cited combination, Levac et al. only teaches the use of server commands for messages that include “delete a message” but is devoid of any suggestion of an arrangement of deleting one or more character strings of a text that are the same as character strings stored in a predetermined file and then converting the character strings representing the text with the character strings deleted into a phonetic character

string. Whitledge et al. is restricted to teaching that documents are edited by a programmer by adding, modifying or deleting elements and content but fails in any manner to suggest the feature of deleting one or more character strings registered from detected text wherein the one or more character strings are the same as character strings registered in a predetermined file. Accordingly, it is not seen that the addition of Whitledge et al.'s editing elements of an HTML document using a Document Object model devoid of deleting character strings that are the same as stored character strings in a predetermined file to Levac et al.'s deleting of entire messages could possibly suggest the deleting one or more character strings registered from the detected text where the one or more character strings are the same as character strings registered in a predetermined file combined with converting the character string that represents the text from which the one or more character strings have been deleted into a phonetic character string as in Claims 9, 13, 34 and 39. It is therefore believed that Claims 9, 13, 34 and 39 are completely distinguished from any combination of Levac et al. and Whitledge et al. and are allowable.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. These claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of

the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' attorney, Douglas W. Pinsky, may be reached in our Washington office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jack S. Cubert  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 24,245

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DC\_MAIN 232011v1